



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

WJK

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/839,679	04/20/2001	Gary J. Sullivan	MS1-601US	1812
22801	7590	01/26/2005	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			CZEKAJ, DAVID J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2613	

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

W/T

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/839,679	SULLIVAN, GARY J.
	Examiner Dave Czekaj	Art Unit 2613

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 October 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 20 April 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10-12-04</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

On pages 8-15, the applicant argues that the examiner failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. While the applicant's points are understood, the examiner respectfully disagrees. While the examiner's obviousness statement may appear to be broad, a lack of description by the examiner does not invalidate a prior-art rejection. Furthermore, the examiner combined MacInnis with Owen to show an interface that would make MacInnis's apparatus more efficient, meaning that, the apparatus now provides a way to easily obtain information from outside sources. Therefore, the rejection has been maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacInnis et al. (6744472), (hereinafter referred to as "MacInnis") in view of Owen et al. (6414996), (hereinafter referred to as "Owen").

Regarding claims 1-2, 10-12, 18, and 24-25, MacInnis discloses an apparatus that relates to an integrated circuit graphics display system (MacInnis: column 1, lines 41-43). This apparatus comprises "receiving a command from a decoder application" (MacInnis: figure 2, item 50, wherein the decoder application is the video decoder) and

“generating one or more filter control command data structures recognizable by a communicatively coupled accelerator including one or more parameters which affect one or more filter settings of the accelerator” (MacInnis: figure 2, column 57, lines 21-37, wherein the filter parameters are the blending, scaling, blitting, and filling, the accelerator is the graphics accelerator). Although MacInnis fails to explicitly show an application interface in MacInnis’s figures, the examiner notes that the system depicted in figure 1 would require an interface to correctly operate. Owen teaches that it is well known in the art to include an application interface with decoder and accelerator systems (Owen: figure 1, wherein the application interface is the navigation manager). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the apparatus disclosed by MacInnis and implement an application interface taught by Owen in order to obtain an apparatus that can operate efficiently by providing a way to easily obtain information from outside sources. One would be further motivated since it is well known in the art to do so.

Regarding claims 3, and 20, MacInnis discloses “the filter is a post-processing filter” (MacInnis: figure 28).

Regarding claim 4, Owen discloses “output data subsequent to the application of a post-processing filter are used as prediction references” (Owen: column 3, lines 20-27, wherein the post processing filter is the half pixel filter).

Regarding claims 5, 14, and 21, MacInnis discloses “the post processing filter is a de-ringing filter” (MacInnis: column 9, lines 52-58, wherein low pass filtering requires the signal to be de-rung).

Regarding claims 6-7, 17, and 23, MacInnis discloses “the parameters include a strength parameter” (MacInnis: column 4, lines 40-51, wherein the strength parameter is the scaling).

Regarding claims 8-9, 15-16, and 22, MacInnis discloses “the API issues control commands for 4 or 16 luminance structures and/or 2, 4, 8, 16, or 32 chrominance structures” (MacInnis: column 9, lines 34-44, wherein the YUV converter uses the above chrominance and luminance structures).

Regarding claim 13, MacInnis discloses “the filter control structures effect one or more of the post processing filters” (MacInnis: figure 2, column 57, lines 21-37, wherein the filter structures indicate whether to blend, scale, blit, and/or fill).

Regarding claim 19, MacInnis in view of Owen disclose “one ore more media accelerators coupled to the decoder application via the API” (MacInnis: figures 1-2, wherein the accelerator is the graphics accelerator, the decoder application is the video decoder; Owen: figure 1, wherein the application interface is the navigation manager).

Conclusion

3. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dave Czekaj whose telephone number is (703) 305-3418. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9 hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on (703) 305-4856. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


CHRIS KELLEY
SUPPLY PATENT EXAMINER
CENTER 2600